

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A281.8
Ex 82
Copy 2

News and Views from the Farm Management Staff

PRINCIPLES AND
FACTS



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Washington, D. C. 20250

October 22, 1965

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

NOV 23 1965

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

Dear Farm Management Extension Workers:

Management Training for Agents

Most States include management as a part of their in-service training programs. This training may vary from a part of a day in an overall induction or refresher type of course to several days on some particular phase of the farm management program.

There is a developing need and a growing demand by many agents for something more basic -- something that will help them feel as much at home in dealing with a business management problem as they have been in meeting problems that involve primarily the use of production technology.

Several management training courses are now being offered that run from 2 to 6 weeks in length. They are designed specifically for county agents, with enrollment coming from a number of States. As this is somewhat of a new emphasis that is likely to grow, we thought it might be of interest to you to know more about it.

Virginia. This course was offered in 1965 in two 3-week segments, the first 3 weeks in June and the second 3 weeks in September. Total enrollment was 15 persons, who came from 4 States. The course is concentrated and thorough, dealing with basic economic principles and their application to specific farm problems. For further information about the course, contact Upton Livermore, V.P.I.

Connecticut. This course of 2 weeks for out of State agents has been offered in the past, whenever there was sufficient demand to make it worthwhile. In 1965 there was an enrollment of 10 persons from 2 States. A problem approach is used throughout the course with the students participating in the instruction. For further details about the course, contact Irving H. Fellows, University of Connecticut.

Oregon. A summer workshop in farm management was conducted for the first time in 1965. It provided an opportunity for 6 weeks of concentrated effort in management, geared primarily to meet the needs of county agents. There were 23 persons from 7 States who took the course in 1965. For further details about the course, contact Manning Becker, Oregon State University.

AST&M-212 (10/65)

Cooperating with Land Grant Colleges and Universities

Arizona. A 3-week course on farm business management will be taught at the 1966 Western Regional Extension Winter School, Tucson, Arizona, January 31-February 18. This course will provide concentrated work in the area of farm business management as well as some effort toward the development of county farm management programs for individual counties. Dr. Charles Beer on our Federal Extension Service staff is scheduled to teach the course.

Do You Have a Need for Any of these Publications?

We have a limited supply available of publications previously distributed from this office. You may have a use for some of them. Write to us directly if you want any of the publications indicated:

1. Report on Farm Budgeting and Planning -- presented at Northeast Farm Management Extension Committee meeting, April 1964. It discusses the application of budgeting and linear programming techniques to forward planning with farmers. FES.
2. Proceedings of North Central Farm Management Workshop -- April 1964. The theme of the conference was Farm Management Educational Techniques for the 1970s.
3. The Management Educational Possibilities of Electronic Mail-In Farm Record Systems -- A review of State projects under way in 1961-62.
4. Proceedings of the Agricultural Symposium -- held at IBM facilities, Endicott, New York. September 23-26, 1963. (This was the second of these conferences.)

Personnel Changes

Duane F. Neuman has been appointed to serve as extension economist in farm management at Raleigh, North Carolina.

Raymond F. Hackler, Seneca, Kansas, was promoted from assistant county extension agent to extension economist in farm management.

Kenneth E. Urban, Colby, Kansas, was promoted from assistant county agricultural agent to extension economist in farm management.

Don D. Pretzer, was reassigned from Mound City, Kansas, to extension economist in farm management and is stationed at Garnett, Kansas.

Hal D. Byarlay was promoted from county agricultural agent to extension economist in farm management at Lincoln, Kansas, effective July 10, 1965.

Wilton B. Thomas, Manhattan, Kansas, as of June 1, 1965, was promoted from district extension economist in farm management to section leader and extension economist in farm management.

Victor E. Jacobs, formerly project leader and extension economist in farm management at Manhattan, Kansas, was reappointed as extension economist at Columbia, Missouri, effective June 1, 1965.

Richard W. Schermerhorn, College Park, Maryland, was reassigned from marketing specialist to specialist in agricultural economics (Marketing and Farm Management).

Edwin W. Cake was reassigned from economist in marketing to economist in farm management at Gainesville, Florida.

Harold D. Collins was promoted from county agricultural extension agent to area extension specialist in farm management at Lexington, Kentucky.

Learrie White, Little Rock, Arkansas, was promoted from extension farm management agent to extension farm management specialist, effective July 1, 1965.

James K. McDermott, Lafayette, Indiana, was reappointed August 1 to extension economist.

Marvin L. Freeman has been reappointed as State farm and home management specialist at College, Alaska. He was formerly employed as assistant agricultural extension specialist in farm management in Minnesota.

Lee Kolmer has been reassigned to State leader in agricultural and economic development at Ames, Iowa.

Julian A. Raburn, Athens, Georgia, who has been extension farm management specialist has had a change in title and is now extension business management specialist-Agricultural-business.

Dempsey H. Seastrunk, farm and home development specialist at Prairie View, Texas, will be on study leave until August 31, 1966.

Clyde L. Barth, extension specialist in farm management in Wyoming, is on an assignment with the U. S. Agency for International Development program teaching agriculture at the University of Ife., Ibadan, Nigeria, until November 30, 1965.

Fred D. Sobering returned to duty as farm management economist at Fargo, North Dakota, as of June 1, 1965.

Roger G. Johnson, farm management specialist, Madison, Wisconsin, is on assignment with the University of Rio Grande de Sul in Porto Alegre, Brazil, under AID contract, June 16, 1965, to June 30, 1966.

Robert W. Wilcox, who has been on foreign duty, returned to duty at Boise, Idaho, as of August 24, 1965.

Fred L. Olson resigned from his position as farm management economist at Fargo, North Dakota, effective May 27, 1965, to accept a position with the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife in Washington, D. C.

Harry G. Anderson, agricultural economist at Fargo, North Dakota, retired as of June 30, 1965.

Rudolph J. Becker has resigned from his position as farm management specialist at University Park, Pennsylvania, to accept a position at Arizona State University at Tampe, Arizona.

Ralph Hepp, who recently finished his Ph.D. work at Wisconsin, has accepted a position on the farm management staff at Michigan.

Implications of Farm Management for Area Agents

Earlier this year FES conducted a study of the use of area agents in 13 States. The objective was to obtain information on how multi-county area agents were being used and to obtain some indication of how this approach to extension work was working out. Some of us in farm management participated in making this study. Copies of the findings of this study have been distributed to directors' offices. However, if you would like to have a copy, let us know and we will send you one.

Many States are giving serious consideration to the use of area agents or to expanding the number where they are already in use. From the information obtained in our study and other observations, we feel that the move to area agents has many implications for farm management work. We found, for example, that agents assigned on an area basis to work with a specific type of farming tend to become more heavily involved in the business and economic aspects of farmers' problems. Thus, this growing interest in the use of specialized area agents would appear to have many implications for the future of farm management extension work.

New Farm Legislation

As you know, new farm legislation has recently been passed. A quick perusal of the contents of this legislation indicates that farmers will have to make a considerable number of decisions around various alternative choices offered in the several titles. Thus, it would appear that there will be many opportunities in our educational programs to assist farmers in developing budgets for alternatives they face in this legislation.

Many administrative decisions and interpretations about the legislation which are necessary for budgeting purposes, are not known at this time. However, we will be distributing these to you as soon as possible.

1964 Census of Agriculture Reports

The first of the preliminary county reports came off the print-out last week. They, along with a State summary, are to be developed State by State in the order of the list of States enclosed. The schedule calls for completion of the last State by June 1966. This will give you some idea when to expect the reports for your counties and State.

A copy of each report will go from the Census Bureau to a contact man in extension economics in each State and to the publications distribution officer.

Sincerely yours,

Buel Lanpher

Buel Lanpher
L. M. Vaughan
E. P. Callahan
Charles Beer
Economists - Farm Management

Enclosure

State Priority1964 Census of Agriculture

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. Rhode Island | 26. Indiana |
| 2. Wisconsin | 27. Ohio |
| 3. Iowa | 28. Oregon |
| 4. Minnesota | 29. Washington |
| 5. North Dakota | 30. Colorado |
| 6. South Dakota | 31. Hawaii |
| 7. New Hampshire | 32. New Jersey |
| 8. Vermont | 33. Delaware |
| 9. Maine | 34. Wyoming |
| 10. Massachusetts | 35. New York |
| 11. Connecticut | 36. Pennsylvania |
| 12. Alaska | 37. Montana |
| 13. Michigan | 38. Utah |
| 14. Nebraska | 39. Maryland |
| 15. Kansas | 40. Arkansas |
| 16. West Virginia | 41. Louisiana |
| 17. Virginia | 42. Georgia |
| 18. Idaho | 43. Mississippi |
| 19. Kentucky | 44. Alabama |
| 20. South Carolina | 45. Arizona |
| 21. North Carolina | 46. New Mexico |
| 22. Nevada | 47. Oklahoma |
| 23. Tennessee | 48. Texas |
| 24. Illinois | 49. Florida |
| 25. Missouri | 50. California |

